

MINUTES

CITY PLAN COMMISSION/ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

JULY 20, 2015

The City Plan Commission/Architectural Review Board of the City of Clayton, Missouri, met upon the above date at 5:30 p.m. Upon roll call, the following responded:

Present:

Chairman Steve Lichtenfeld
Mark Winings, Aldermanic Representative
Craig Owens, City Manager
Ron Reim
Josh Corson
Sherry Eisenberg

Absent:

Vacant Seat

Also Present:

Susan M. Istenes, AICP, Director of Planning & Development Services
Louis Clayton, Planner
Kevin O'Keefe, City Attorney

Chairman Lichtenfeld asked that all cell phone ringers be turned off, that conversations take place outside the meeting room and that those who wish to speak approach the podium and to be sure the green light on the microphone is on for property recording of this meeting.

MINUTES

The minutes of the June 15th and July 6th, 2015 meetings were approved, after having been previously distributed to each member.

SITE PLAN/ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – NEW SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE – 148 NORTH CENTRAL AVENUE

Lauren Strutman, project architect, was in attendance at the meeting. Also in attendance were David Volz, project civil engineer, Bruce Korn, builder, and Kent & Patricia Chapin, owners.

Susan Istenes explained that this is a request for review of the site plan associated with the proposed construction of a new 4,060 square foot single family residence (excluding basement) with a below grade, front entry garage. The existing 3,712 square foot home is to be

demolished. The height of the proposed residence is 32-feet 11 7/8-inches as measured from the average existing grade to the mean height of the roof. The 8,008-square-foot property is located on the east side of North Central Avenue between Pershing Avenue and Maryland Avenue and has a zoning designation of R-3 One and Two Family Dwelling District. Geothermal heating and cooling is proposed and therefore no HVAC units will be located outside the building. A generator and pool equipment are proposed in the rear yard and will be screened by a new retaining wall and an existing wood privacy fence. Trash will be stored in a 52-square-foot trash enclosure located beneath the front terrace adjacent to the garage. The existing impervious coverage on site is 62.1 percent. The new plans decrease the impervious coverage to 54.5 percent, which is below the maximum allowable impervious coverage of 55 percent. The proposed impervious coverage for the required front yard is 48.7 percent which is above the allowable 45 percent. In instances where an applicant can demonstrate just cause, the Plan Commission has the authority to approve a modification of up to an additional 5 percent of the impervious coverage requirements. The Plan Commission has historically approved similar requests for projects in Old Town primarily due to the narrowness of the lots and the prevalence of front-entry garages. The applicant has not submitted justification for this request. The existing storm water runoff, according to the MSD 15 year, 20 minute calculation, is 0.52 cubic feet per second (CFS). The proposed runoff is 0.49 CFS, which represents a decrease in 0.03 CFS, and therefore, onsite storm water mitigation is not required. Downspouts will be piped to pop-up bubblers in the front and rear yard. The rear yard pop-up bubbler should be relocated at least 10 feet from the rear property line. The Public Works Department has reviewed the site plan and finds the storm water plan acceptable. The proposed landscape design features a variety of understory trees, ornamental grasses and shrubs that are appropriate for the size of the site and character of the neighborhood. The landscape plan shows the removal of 48 caliper inches of deciduous trees, of which 24.5 caliper inches require replacement. The landscape plan proposes 26 caliper inches of new deciduous trees. The City's contracted landscape architect is of the opinion that the proposed trees are suitable for the site and the existing trees to remain are shown to be protected and preserved per City guidelines. The Public Works Department has approved the applicant's request to remove an existing 30-caliper-inch street tree and requires a payment of \$7,926 to the City's Forestry Fund. The City Forester recommends that the new street tree be a 4-caliper-inch Swamp White Oak rather than the proposed Red Maple. Exterior lighting is proposed at all doors and the garage. All exterior lights will be 75 watts or below. Susan stated that the proposed home is compatible with surrounding homes in the neighborhood. Storm water will be adequately managed on site, the landscape plan provides for a variety of new trees, shrubs, and groundcover that is suitable for the area and that the height and setbacks as proposed are in conformance with the requirements of the R-3 One and Two Family Dwelling District. The project meets the criteria for site plan approval and therefore, staff recommends approval with the following conditions:

1. That the applicant pay \$7,926 into the City's Forestry Fund prior to the issuance of a building permit. (Susan noted that the \$8,338 amount listed in the staff report is incorrect); and

2. That the landscape plan be revised to show the new street tree to be a 4-caliper-inch Swamp White Oak, to be approved by staff prior to the issuance of a building permit.

Ms. Strutman introduced David Volz, Bruce Korn and the owners to the members. She presented a site plan, explaining that the home features a below grade, tuck under, front entry garage; that there will be no HVAC units and that a pool and pool equipment will be in the rear yard. She indicated that they worked closely with City staff regarding the driveway which is located in the center of the lot. She noted that Baxter Gardens prepared a detailed landscape plan.

Chairman Lichtenfeld asked about storm water drainage.

Mr. Volz presented an existing and proposed site plan which compared the impervious coverage for each. He noted that there will be less driveway surface area which will reduce run-off. He noted that half the roof will flow to the west and the other half to the east; 1 emitter in the rear yard and 2 more in the front yard which will result in less flow to the east and west.

Louis Clayton noted that there is a decrease in cfs of 0.03 (going from 0.52 to 0.49).

Ms. Chapin informed the members that during the initial site review, they were asked to pay a fine into the Forestry fund after a manual calculation; now it is \$3,000 more, which is a significant increase. She asked that they be allowed to work with staff and allow some flexibility regarding the new street tree as they want a Red Maple and the City is asking for a Swamp White Oak.

Ron Reim asked about the difference in payment due the Forestry fund.

Ms. Chapin indicated that in early March she was told that the database was being changed out and not available at the time so it was manually calculated.

Spencer Litteken, Civil Engineer, City's Public Works Department, informed the members that City staff established an estimated value which was noted as an estimate and subject to change; the value of the street trees are actually determined by a third party. He stated that a certified arborist makes a site visit and looks at other area trees to determine what species would be desired; noting that a Swamp White Oak does better in a narrower tree lawn.

Mark Winings asked about the front yard impervious coverage issue, noting that no just cause was given by the applicant as to why a modification was being requested.

Ms. Strutman stated that there is a minimal amount of paving in the front yard and that the owners need the front sidewalk.

Chairman Lichtenfeld stated that the motion would need to include approval of a modification if the Commission wants to grant it. He noted the applicant is asking for 48.7% coverage; 3.7% over the allowed coverage of 45%.

Ms. Strutman emphasized that the total proposed lot coverage is below the allowable amount.

Mark Winings indicated that this is a common problem with front entry garages; he just wanted the record to reflect the reasoning.

Mr. Volz stated that the new house sits about 30-feet from the street; the existing house sits about 28-feet from the street. He stated if the new driveway was any narrower, garage access would be difficult.

Josh Corson stated that he has no issue with them planting a Red Maple. He added that it is unfortunate that the payment amount was initially miscalculated, but that it was only an estimate.

Being no further questions or comments from the members and hearing no questions or comments from the audience, Chairman Lichtenfeld called for a motion.

Ron Reim made a motion to approve the site plan per staff recommendations 1 (\$7,926 payment into Fund) and 2 (new street tree), noting that this Commission is offering the applicant the opportunity to further work with City staff to allow a Red Maple only if City staff allows (if not, the applicant must plant a Swamp White Oak as noted in the report).

Susan Istenes noted that the established fine and variety of street trees are at the discretion of the City's Public Works Department pursuant to their professional opinion.

The motion was seconded by Josh Corson and unanimously approved by the members.

The architectural aspects of the project were now up for review.

Susan Istenes explained that this is a request for review of the design and materials associated with the proposed construction of a new 4,060-square-foot single-family residence (excluding the basement) with a below grade, front-loading garage. The existing home to be demolished is a 3,712-square-foot, one-and-a-half story craftsman style house, built in 1919, and is one of four remaining historic homes on the block. The home to the south (146 North Central Avenue) is a traditional brick American foursquare, built in 1910, and the home to the north (150 North Central Avenue) is a postmodern contemporary brick home, built in 1999. Infill homes on the block, which were built primarily between 1995 and 2005, share the following common architectural and siting characteristics:

1. They are constructed primarily of brick or stucco.

2. They are built in one of the following architectural styles: Postmodern Contemporary, Federal, Neoclassical, Italianate, Classical Composite or Classical Eclectic.
3. They are built upon an elevated, earthen terrace that rises four to six feet above the adjacent sidewalk and have a two or three car, front-access garage that is semi-depressed and located on the basement level of the house.
4. They have a street-facing front entry and a street-facing front terrace above the garage access.
5. They are approximately 35 to 40 feet in width, two-and-a-half to three stories (excluding the basement level) with a total overall height of approximately 28 to 32 feet from average finished grade to the mean roof elevation.

In an effort to assist planning staff and the decision making bodies make informed decisions regarding new development projects, the City has contracted with H3 Studio who, under the direction of the Planning Director, will review and analyze development proposals for compliance with the City's adopted ordinances, plans, and best practices in urban design and architecture. The analysis and recommendations in this staff report are summarized from a report prepared by H3 Studio.

Building Form and Mass

The height of the proposed home is 32-feet 11 7/8-inches as measured from average existing grade to the mean elevation of the roof, which is two feet below maximum height permitted in the R-3 Zoning District. The proposed home is 2-feet 7-inches taller than the building to the south (146 North Central Avenue), and the two homes have similar roof forms and proportions as viewed from the street. The proposed home is +/- 13 feet taller than the building to the north (150 North Central Avenue). The building to the north is one of the shorter homes on the block due to its lower than usual basement level and low roof pitch.

The first and second floor levels of the proposed home are +/- 6 feet higher than those of the neighboring homes. The proportions of the front entry porch to the front entry door and the front elevation as a whole do not generally match that of the neighboring homes resulting in a porch structure that is approximately four feet taller, relative to the overall elevation, than is typical of adjacent homes.

Building Materials & Architectural Details

The primary building materials are tan brick veneer with cast-stone trim and stucco accents. Black casement windows are proposed, and the proposed roof is clad in architectural shingles, "Harvard Slate" in color. A 12-foot wide, exposed aggregate driveway is proposed and will lead to a below grade, front-entry garage. A single carriage style garage door, tan in color, is proposed.

The overall architectural style of the house is a contemporary interpretation of the historical French Second Empire or French Eclectic which is characterized by eyebrow arches and dormers, a steeply-pitched roof, flared eave profiles, and multi-pane casement windows. This style is not

currently found in the neighborhood; however, most homes in the neighborhood are contemporary interpretations of other historical styles.

Fence and Retaining Walls

Brick retaining walls will be located on both sides of the driveway, and along a portion of the front walkway. Several 5-6-foot modular block retaining walls are proposed in the rear yard adjacent to the pool and patio. An existing wood privacy fence located along the side property lines will remain. A new 6-foot wood privacy fence is proposed along the rear property line.

Susan noted that the proposed project is in conformance with the height and setback requirements of the R-3 One and Two Family Dwelling District and the Architectural Review Guidelines. It is the opinion of the City's contract architect that the proposed structure demonstrates sufficient compatibility with neighboring homes, and more specifically that:

1. The square footage, number of bedrooms, and overall configuration is similar to what is seen in other infill homes in the neighborhood.
2. The massing, proportion, and overall size of the proposed project are somewhat compatible with other neighboring homes.
3. The proportion of the front entry porch while different from adjacent buildings, does not demonstrate incompatibility with adjacent homes.
4. The style of the proposed house is generally compatible with the surrounding homes.
5. In general, the proposed building materials below the gutter line appear to be of high quality and are appropriate to the neighborhood and compatible with neighboring structures.

Compatibility could be further enhanced by reducing the overall height of the proposed home through the following actions:

1. Lowering the level of the basement floor by increasing the slope of the driveway to 12 percent with appropriate transitions at each end, and
2. Lowering the first floor elevation by 1 foot, thereby reducing the floor-to-ceiling height of the basement storage and garage. This would preserve the elevation of the basement floor and grade of the driveway while reducing the overall height and apparent mass of the building.

Susan stated that the applicant does not wish to lower the basement floor level due to safety concerns associated with a 12 percent driveway slope. The applicant also does not wish to reduce the floor-to-ceiling height of the basement. Letters of support from the residents of 159 and 146 North Central Avenue have been submitted. Susan stated that staff recommends approval with the following condition:

1. That the applicant revise the plans to reduce the overall height of the home by the following methods, to be approved by staff prior to the issuance of a building permit:
 - a. Lower the level of the basement floor by increasing the slope of the driveway to 12 percent with appropriate transitions at each end; and,

- b. Lower the first floor elevation by 1 foot, thereby reducing the floor-to-ceiling height of the basement.

Susan informed the members that Tim Busse with H3 Studio was in attendance this evening.

Ms. Strutman presented a color rendering and material samples to the Board. She presented samples of the tan brick, architectural shingle (harbor slate color) roof, tan stucco, and tan window. She indicated that plans for this home have been turned in to the City three times. She stated that the first floor of this residence is 1.8-feet higher than that of the home to the south and 3.5-feet higher than that of the home to the north; noting that North Central Avenue slopes toward the south and this property is on the crest. She stated that for a home of this quality, it is not typical to lower the garage height. She presented elevation drawings, noting that much of the home is 1 or 1 ½ stories in height; not 2. She added that in addition, a 12% driveway slope is not safe.

Chairman Lichtenfeld asked if the driveway has an ice melt system.

Lauren Strutman replied “no”. She informed the members that Dave Volz has stated that cars can “bottom-out” on a driveway with a 12% slope in such a short distance.

Mr. Volz indicated that he always tries to keep driveway slopes below 10% and that at 12%, it would need to be heated.

Chairman Lichtenfeld stated that he’s okay with the 8% slope as proposed; noting that they took care lowering the roofline.

Ms. Strutman commented that the roofline’s been lowered since the original submittal.

Chairman Lichtenfeld stated that it appears that this property is at the peak of the hill. He reiterated that he’s okay with the driveway and floor heights.

Sherry Eisenberg stated that she is curious about driveway slopes of neighboring properties.

Mr. Volz indicated that he didn’t know; adding that when they develop a design, they always avoid a 12% slope.

Ron Reim asked for an explanation of how the roof was lowered prior to this proposal.

Ms. Strutman stated that the bearings were lowered. She reiterated that the entire house is not 2 stories. She added that there is not a 6-foot difference in floor levels, either.

Louis Clayton noted that the numbers came from H3.

Mr. Busse indicated that the analysis was made measuring the first floor from the sidewalk.

Ms. Strutman stated that a licensed surveyor conducted their measurements and they believe it to be approximately 3.5-feet.

Chairman Lichtenfeld commented that it is a steep street that contains structures with varying heights; many due to the driveway. He stated that in his opinion, the proposal here should not be changed.

Mark Winings indicated that it has been noted that the owners of 159 & 146 North Central Avenue support this proposal. He asked the applicant if they had anything from the owners of 150.

Ms. Chapin replied “no”.

Mark Winings asked if the owners of 150 have expressed opposition.

Ms. Chapin replied “no”, noting that they have seen the plans.

Ron Reim asked about the basement’s clear height.

Ms. Strutman replied that the majority of the basement ceiling height is 9-foot, 4-inches and that it is her opinion that a high quality home should not have a basement ceiling height of 8-feet. She stated that they would prefer that the current design not change.

Chairman Lichtenfeld asked about the front steps.

Ms. Strutman indicated that the front steps consist of 3 step segments separated by a landing.

Sherry Eisenberg asked the height of the garage door.

Ms. Strutman replied “8-feet”.

Chairman Lichtenfeld called for a motion, as there were no more questions or comments from the members or the audience.

Josh Corson made a motion to approve as proposed. The motion was seconded by Mark Winings and unanimously approved by the Board.

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW - EXTERIOR RENOVATION/ADDITION – COMMERCIAL –
21 NORTH MERAMEC AVENUE

Jay Schoessel, project architect, was in attendance at the meeting.

Susan Istenes explained that the subject property is 3,500 square feet in size, located on the west side of North Meramec Avenue between Maryland Avenue and Forsyth Boulevard, has a zoning designation of HDC High Density Commercial District and is located in the Downtown Overlay Zoning District. The site contains an existing two-story, 3,505-square-foot commercial building which was constructed in 1961. A surface parking lot containing three parking spaces is located at the rear of the building and is accessible from a public alley.

In addition to an interior remodel of the building, the applicant proposes the following:

1. A two-story, 700-square foot rear addition
2. A 400-square-foot rooftop elevator lobby, canopy and terrace
3. Enlarged second floor windows on the front elevation

The west (rear) elevation of the rear addition will be brick to match the building. New windows and a new building entrance are also proposed. The north elevation will be stucco to match the existing building. The existing elevator shaft will be extended to the roof to a new 400-square-foot elevator lobby. The exterior of the lobby will be clad in grey EIFS. A canopy will extend from the lobby to the east, partially covering a private rooftop terrace with seating and a bar area to be used by the building tenant(s). The canopy will be constructed of steel tube supports and clad in grey EIFS. The seating area will be surrounded by planter walls on the north and south and a glass railing on the front. Mechanical equipment is located on the roof behind the new lobby, and will be screened by an EIFS mechanical screen. The building height will measure 35 feet 10 inches to the top of the elevator lobby and canopy. The Downtown Overlay Zoning District Regulations require buildings in excess of 2.5 stories provide a 10 foot step-back at the third story level. The roof top lobby will be set back 29 feet from the front of the building, and the canopy will be set back 16 feet in conformance with this requirement. No changes to the surface parking lot are proposed. The total size of the structure, including the additions, is +/- 4,605 square feet. Whenever a building or use constructed or established after April 14, 1959 is changed or enlarged in floor area, parking spaces shall be provided on the basis of the enlargement or change. Therefore, four parking spaces are required in addition to the existing three spaces on site. The applicant has submitted proof of a parking agreement for the use of up to three parking spaces located at 26 North Meramec Avenue (Seven Gables Inn). The parking spaces are located within 500 feet of the subject property and therefore qualify as onsite parking. One additional parking space is required to meet the City's parking requirements. Based on the City's Bicycle Parking Regulations, the project is required to provide one bicycle rack; however, one has not been shown on the plans. Staff recommends that the applicant submit a site plan showing the location of the required bicycle rack in conformance with the Bicycle Parking Regulations, to be approved by staff prior to the issuance of a building permit. Susan stated that staff is of the opinion that the design and materials of the addition are compatible in terms of mass, height, and design with existing nearby structures. The rooftop lobby and canopy will be partially screened from the north by existing trees, and will be set back from the front of the building in accordance with the Downtown Overlay Zoning District and therefore, staff recommends approval with the following conditions:

1. That the applicant submit a site plan showing the location of the required bicycle rack in conformance with the City's Bicycle Parking Regulations, to be approved by staff prior to the issuance of a building permit.
2. That the applicant submit proof of a parking agreement for four parking spaces in conformance with the City's Parking Regulations prior to the issuance of a building permit.

Mr. Schoessel indicated that staff's report is accurate. He presented a material board to the members. He asked that his clients be allowed to re-work the existing parking to accommodate one more parking space so along with the 3 rented off-site spaces, they would satisfy the City's parking regulations; likewise, the requirement for the bicycle parking which they will provide at the rear of the building.

Mr. Schoessel described the items on the sample board that included EIFS to match the color and texture of the existing stucco, and a photo of the existing brick and mortar which they intend to match. He noted that the elevator lobby will be set back from the street, as shown on the photo included in their submittal which was taken 6 feet above the sidewalk at Seven Gables.

Chairman Lichtenfeld asked the function of the building.

Mr. Schoessel indicated that it is used as offices and parties for a charitable organization.

Chairman Lichtenfeld asked if one exit stair from the roof is okay per Code.

Mr. Schoessel informed the members that he spoke with the Building Official regarding sprinklering the building and that yes, based on the number of occupants, one exit from the roof is okay.

Chairman Lichtenfeld asked if the north elevation of the addition will line up with the existing north elevation.

Mr. Schoessel replied "yes".

Chairman Lichtenfeld asked if new materials will only be used on the addition.

Mr. Schoessel replied "yes".

Sherry Eisenberg questioned if there are other roof decks in Clayton.

Louis Clayton indicated that the others that he is aware of are on the roofs of high rise residential buildings.

Craig Owens stated that there is one on the roof of the bank building at Forsyth and Meramec.

Chairman Lichtenfeld asked what material will be used for the roof deck floor.

Mr. Schoessel replied “stone pavers”.

Mark Winings stated that it’s a nice, updated look and that he likes the rooftop.

Chairman Lichtenfeld agreed. He asked for a motion, barring any further questions or comments.

Hearing no further questions or comments, Ron Reim made a motion to approve per staff recommendation No. 1 and a re-wording of No. 2 to require a total of 7 parking spaces be provided in accordance with the City’s parking regulations. Proof of parking must be submitted to the City prior to issuance of a building permit. The motion was seconded by Josh Corson and unanimously approved by the Board.

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – LANDSCAPING – 8300-8400 MARYLAND AVENUE – CALERES (FORMERLY BROWN SHOE)

John Effrig, Lawrence Group, landscape architect, was in attendance at the meeting.

Susan Istenes explained that this is a request for consideration of a landscape plan for the Caleres building (formerly Brown Shoe). The subject property is located on the south side of Maryland Avenue between Gay Avenue and Tipton Way and contains a large two-story brick and concrete building. Coinciding with renovations to the interior of the building, on June 16, 2014, the Architectural Review Board approved several improvements to modernize the site including:

1. A new entry plaza at the southwest corner of Maryland Avenue and Tipton Way
2. A new paved plaza/waiting area and flagpole along Tipton Way
3. Relocating the “shoe” public art sculpture to the western part of the main campus
4. New landscaping throughout the site

The proposed landscaping at the time was conceptual, and included eight new Oak trees along Maryland Avenue and Tipton Way, reshaping of the existing English Ivy beds, and new Boxwood hedges throughout the campus. The applicant has now submitted a detailed landscape plan which proposes extensive new landscaping along the entire Maryland Avenue and Tipton Way frontages. The landscaping will be installed in two phases. The proposed landscape design features a variety of shade tolerant shrubs, perennials ferns and grasses that are appropriate for the north and east sides of the building. The landscape

plan shows the removal of 228.5 caliper inches of deciduous trees, the majority of which are in poor condition, and 208 caliper inches of existing trees will be preserved. Because this project only requires Architectural Review, tree replacement is not required. The landscape plan proposes 72 caliper inches of new deciduous trees (24 caliper inches of canopy trees and 48 caliper inches of understory/flowering trees). The landscape beds will be bordered by a 3-5-foot wide paver edge. Several 1.75-foot tall garden walls are proposed intermittently along the landscape edge, and will be constructed of a modular block system (Belmuro by Unilock). The Architectural Review Guidelines recommend that retaining walls be constructed of brick, stone or stucco to match the main structure. Modular block wall systems have been approved in the past provided they have varying block sizes, varying color patterns and tumbled or rolled edges. Staff has researched the proposed retaining wall materials and it does not appear to meet the City's requirements for retaining walls, and staff recommends that the applicant submit revised plans depicting an approved wall material. The landscape plan was reviewed by the City's contracted landscape architect, who is of the opinion that the plan provides an attractive plant palette of shade tolerant shrubs, perennials ferns and grasses that are appropriate for the north and east sides of the building, in addition to attractive tree species, and annual plantings. The existing Sweet Gum trees along the Maryland frontage will be protected and preserved per City guidelines, and will continue to provide a sense of scale for the building. Susan stated that staff recommends approval of the plan subject to the following conditions:

1. That the applicant submit revised plans depicting an approved retaining wall material, to be approved by staff prior to the issuance of a building permit.
2. That the applicant submit an application and plans to amend the current building permit to reflect the approved landscape plan.

Mr. Effrig stated that their goal was to provide a balanced and naturalistic look that will complement the building and new plaza. He stated that they conducted a survey of existing trees and are preserving all trees that are in good condition; only removing trees that are declining or in poor health. He noted they are preserving the Oak at the main entry and adding two Ginkos. He stated that the proposed plan is diverse and ornamental; they strived to create a botanical garden; they want the landscaping to be noticed by motorists driving by. He stated that the pavers are precast concrete (Unilock product). He stated that the wall product they propose to use is available in two different sizes; 10 X 10 and 20 X 10 and the color will complement the new pavers well.

Chairman Lichtenfeld asked the rhyme or reason for the proposal; he asked if they tried to cluster certain plants. He referred to a proposal this Board saw about a year ago for an exterior stairway and where they were with that.

Kathy Hossey, representing Caleres, indicated that the exterior stairway plan was dropped. She added that they worked with the City's Fire Marshal and that they have developed a sprinkler plan.

Ron Reim asked where the walls are proposed.

Mr. Effrig indicated that there are two free-standing walls by the shoe sculpture and in the center.

Mark Winings asked if it is staff's position that the proposed wall material is not complimentary.

Louis Clayton indicated that is correct; no spec sheet was submitted with the application. He stated that staff did research the product and that this Board can vote to approve it.

Chairman Lichtenfeld asked how high the blocks are.

Mr. Effrig replied 6 ½-inches.

Chairman Lichtenfeld asked if the walls would then be 3 layers high.

Mr. Effrig replied "yes".

Chairman Lichtenfeld asked if the front of the block face is smooth.

Mr. Effrig replied "yes"; adding, however, that they have a finished look.

Josh Corson asked about the wall cap.

Mr. Effrig stated that the granite cap will be 2-inches in height; a photo of the proposed wall was distributed.

Chairman Lichtenfeld asked if both size blocks would be used.

Mr. Effrig replied "yes"; they could use both sizes.

Mark Winings questioned how committed they were to using this product.

Chairman Lichtenfeld stated that he likes the color but the photo says "concrete block". He stated that he would like the wall to have some texture as opposed to smooth.

Mark Winings agreed.

Ron Reim asked if they would have to come back with an alternate wall material or if that is something staff can take care of.

Chairman Lichtenfeld referred to staff's recommendation.

Being no further questions or comments, Mark Winings made a motion to approve per staff recommendation. The motion was seconded by Ron Reim and unanimously approved by the Board.

Mr. Effrig thanked the Board.

Being no further question or comments, this meeting adjourned at 7:05 p.m.

Recording Secretary